

## NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD

### Minutes

The regular meeting of the Natural Resources Board was held on Wednesday, August 17, 2005 at Northwest Sports Complex, 301 Walnut St., Spooner, Wisconsin. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. for action on items 1-7. The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

**Wednesday, August 17, 2005**

#### **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

1. Organizational Matters

1.A. Calling the roll

Jerry O'Brien	Dan Poulson	Jonathan Ela
Herb Behnke	Christine Thomas	John Welter
Steve Willett		

Welcome from County Board Chair, Washburn County, **Peter Hubin**

1.B. Approval of minutes from June 22, 2005

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the minutes from June 22, 2005. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

1.C. Approval of agenda for August 17, 2005

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of the agenda from August 17, 2005. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

1.D. Approval of conference call minutes from July 21, 2005

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the minutes from July 21, 2005. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

2. Ratification of Acts of the Department Secretary

2.A. Real Estate Transactions

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of the real estate transactions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3. Action Items

3.A. Air, Waste, and Water/Enforcement

3.A.1. Adoption of Board Order AM-18-05, revisions to NR 400, relating to the definition of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and VOC emissions from yeast manufacturing facilities.

**Lloyd Eagan**, Director, Air Management Bureau stated the Department is requesting the adoption of rule revision relating to the definition of "Volatile Organic Compound" in NR 400 and related changes to NR 438 to restore conformity with the federal regulations at 40 CFR 51.100 (s). In addition, the adoption of revision to NR 424.05 is requested to address inconsistencies with the national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for yeast manufacturers.

1. Exclusion of four compounds from the definition of VOC in NR 400.02(162).

2. A nomenclature clarification to two previously excluded compounds from the VOC definition in NR 400.02(162).

3. Exclusion of one compound from the definition of VOC for purposes of VOC emission limitation or VOC content requirements, but not for purposes of all record-keeping, emission reporting and inventory requirements. This revision requires related changes to NR 438.03(1).

4. Incorporating the USEPA VOC emission control requirement for yeast manufacturing into NR 424.05.

The Board last acted on these rules at its May 2005 meeting when it authorized the Department to hold public hearing. As a result of comments received from Wisconsin Legislative Council Rules Clearinghouse, some editorial changes were made in the proposed rule revision. The Department has not received any other comments on the subject matter of the rule revisions.

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett adoption of technical correction to accompany Board Order AM-18-05, "The reference to 'Table 2' in NR 445.06(2)(a)5 be changed to 'Table 1'". The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Poulson MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela adoption of Board Order AM-18-05, revisions to NR 400, relating to the definition of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and VOC emissions from yeast manufacturing facilities. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.2. Adoption of Board Order WA-15-05, revisions to NR 500, streamlining.

**Suzanne Bangert**, Director, Waste Management Bureau stated that at the February 2005 meeting, the Board authorized the Department to hold public hearings to solicit input on the proposed revisions to the NR 500 series. These proposed rules are the result of two years of collaboration between the Department and a small group of external stakeholders and the Department. They also clarify existing requirements, correct errors in existing code language, and include minor fee adjustments. In addition, the Department is taking this opportunity to provide clarification between the Drinking Water and Groundwater program's and the Waste Management program's rules concerning granting a variance and exemption to private wells located within 1200 feet of a landfill. The Department is also making minor revisions to the Medical Waste rules (NR 526) to clarify the US DOT rules preempt Department rules and how the rules apply to different wastes and generators. The Department convened public hearings on April 12 and 14 and accepted public comments through April 25, 2005. As part of the comment process, 20 individuals commented on the proposed rules and a response to public comments has been developed and is provided as part of the green sheet package. In response to the public comments and comments from the Legislative Rules Clearing House, the Department has made changes to the proposed rules. The only item that may be somewhat controversial is continuing to require that a borrow source developed to supply liner soil be subject to the initial site inspection and environmental analysis.

**Mr. Willett** asked about the majority of small municipal dumps that are closed. The location of borrowed sites is very difficult in certain areas. Is this adding another layer of regulation to the process?

**Ms. Bangert** stated that she didn't believe it was. As serving as a single point of contact of approval of those sites, we can provide a more efficient, expedited review of those sites because we are coordinating to address watershed issues.

**Mr. Willett** asked if it adds further regulation as to what can be used.

**Ms. Bangert** stated that it doesn't add further regulation in terms of what can be used because wetland rules already determine that.

**Mr. Welter** asked about licensed soil scientist who certify these proposals and having to meet certain requirements. Is there intent to go through the various codes and determine a role for these certified soil scientists as opposed to other certified specialties.

**Ms. Bangert** stated that she doesn't think that was the intent.

**Mr. Welter** asked who are the people that we would go to about that comprehensive approach.

**Ms. Bangert** stated the staff in the waste management program and the watershed program.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela adoption of Board Order WA-15-05, revisions to NR 500, streamlining. The motion carried by all members.**

3.A.3. Adoption of Board Order FH-12-05, revisions to NR 329 and NR 345, related to Miscellaneous Structures in Navigable Waters and Dredging in Navigable Waters.

**Mike Staggs**, Director, Fisheries Management and Habitat Protection Bureau stated The purpose of standards for the following general permits: pea gravel blankets (NR 329) and maintenance dredging of previously dredged areas (NR 345) (both statutorily-required general permits); manual dredging, jetting to harvest aquatic plants and dredging less than 25 cubic yards from a river or stream. Revisions to NR 329 also include changes to the Purpose and Applicability sections to identify that the rule applies to all structures in navigable waters other than activities regulated under another rule.

The Board previously authorized the pea gravel blanket, manual dredging and maintenance dredging permits on August 24, 2004, as part of the second emergency orders issued to implement Act 118. The proposed rule revisions contain minor clarifying revisions and modifications in response to public comments and Legislative Council Rules Clearinghouse comments.

All types of waterfront property owners - from private landowners to businesses, builders and developers - who wish to pursue one of the 5 activities will be interested in the proposed additional general permits that provide specific standards, a shorter permit review and reduced permit fee. Conservation organizations and the public who use and enjoy Wisconsin's navigable waters will be interested in the proposed standards to ensure that they protect public rights in navigable waters.

**Mr. Willett** asked about the definition of privately owned water bodies.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that it could be flowages and ponds depends on how they are classed, the date constructed, and its connection to navigable waters.

**Mr. Ela** asked why are these streams are dredged under 25 cubic yards.

**Mr. Staggs** stated dredging upstream for bridges to maintain flow is most common, but also for fish habitat development.

**Mr. Behnke** asked about the limit of 25 cubic yards of dredging per year, per property. Why would we want the water disturbed consecutive years rather than just disturbing it once?

**Mr. Staggs** stated that it depends upon the situation. If someone doesn't qualify for a general permit, there is still the individual permit option.

**Mr. Welter** asked about the permits taken out by adjacent landowner and if there is anything preventing someone from asking adjacent landowners to dredge for their neighbors.

**Mr. Staggs** stated no unless it affects the area of special resource interest or public rights feature.

**Mr. Poulson** asked about dredging and whether it is just for maintenance or does it include any new dredging.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that it only covers areas that have been dredged in the past. There is a permit for agriculture drainage districts.

**Mr. Poulson** asked about the stockpiling issue. Can it only be stockpiled or can the spoils be spread?

**Mr. Staggs** stated there is no issue with stockpiling if it's above the ordinary high water mark and not in a wetlands area. Spreading issues have come up when it's disposal is in a wetland or below the ordinary high water mark.

Filling is covered under a different permit

**Mr. Poulson** stated that his point is that the land is being tilled to farm, there shouldn't be an added cost to haul the fill away when it could be spread on land being cultivated.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that is a valid point if the area is used for agricultural purposes. Wetland issues aren't covered in the general permits. Act 118 doesn't affect any wetland regulations in NR 103.

**Mr. Ela** asked about general permit for maintenance dredging in unpermitted situations. Would that only occur if the project started before permitting was required in 1943?

**Mr. Staggs** stated not sure how we would sort out a situation where someone did an unpermitted, perhaps illegal dredged operation back in the 1950s. The rule requires that the permit applicant provide some documentation that it had been dredged.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke adoption of Board Order FH-12-05, revisions to NR 329 and NR 345, related to Miscellaneous Structures in Navigable Waters and Dredging in Navigable Waters. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.4. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WT-35-05, revisions to NR 118, relating to standards for the Lower St. Croix Riverway

**Russ Rasmussen**, Director, Watershed Management Bureau stated that a minor modification is proposed to the recently enacted NR 118 revisions to change the riverway management zone designations for a portion of the Village of Osceola, and for a portion of the City of St. Croix Falls. The change will be from small town historic management zone to river town management zone. This change has been requested by both municipalities and is necessary to accurately reflect the existing character of these areas. The proposed modification will address concerns raised by both municipalities. Department staff has discussed these concerns with the municipalities and with local legislators. This modification will give both municipalities more flexibility for permitting business uses while protecting the existing character of the riverway and maintaining the intent of the rules. Implementing this change will allow business uses to continue as a permitted use rather than requiring a conditional use permit process for each proposed new business or modification of an existing business.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WT-35-05, revisions to NR 118, relating to standards for the Lower St. Croix Riverway. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.A.5. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WT-33-05, revisions to NR 102 and NR 207, relating to special designation for waters in the Lake Superior basin.

**Chuck Ledin**, Bureau Director, Office of the Great Lakes stated that the Department is requesting authorization for a public hearing on proposed rule changes to protect the waters of the Lake Superior basin from toxic pollutants. Following a public hearing in 1997 on similar rule proposal, there were concerns expressed by basin residents. As a result, an advisory group was formed to assess those proposals and provide a recommendation back to the Secretary. In August 2002, the advisory committee recommended three changes to water quality rules to

1. extend the outstanding resource water designation for currently designated tributaries into Lake Superior for a ¼ mile arc at the river mouth.
2. Prohibit any new or increased discharge of the nine toxic pollutants targeted in the zero discharge demonstration agreement unless the applicant certifies that the discharge is necessary after utilization of best technology in process and control and
3. Create an outstanding resource water designation for the waters of Lake Superior within ¼ mile of the shoreline of the islands in the Apostle Island National Shoreline

Action on the recommendations was deferred with the agreement of the advisory group when EPA proposed rule changes, which could have been in conflict with these proposals. EPA subsequently withdrew their proposals due to the controversy with their proposed changes.

**Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WT-33-05, revisions to NR 102 and NR 207, relating to special designation for waters in the Lake Superior basin.**

Mr. Ela asked what the Outstanding Resource Water (OWR) additional protections are.

Mr. Ledin stated that OWR designations stated that for any wastewater discharge that occurs at these waters would have to be treated to a level where it would not change existing water quality and if property owners wanted to get a permit under ch. 30 provisions, they may receive an individual permit rather than qualify for a general permit.

Mr. Ela asked why the shoreline was stripped from the Apostle Island Lakeshore side.

Mr. Ledin stated that was the recommendation from the committee.

Mr. Willett add that it had to do with tribal issues.

Mr. Ela asked what the nature of controversy was in 1996.

Mr. Ledin stated that some individuals wanted the standard to be more protected and some wanted the standards to be less protected.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B. Land Management, Recreation, and Fisheries/Wildlife

3.B.1. Adoption of Board Orders WM-19-05 and WM-20-05(E), revisions to NR 10, establishing the 2005 migratory game bird season.

Kent Van Horn, Migratory Bird Staff Specialist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that this rule order establishes the season length and bag limits for the 2005 Wisconsin Migratory game bird seasons. For ducks, the state is divided into two zones each with 60-day seasons. The season begins at noon Sept. 24 and continues for 60 consecutive days in the north, closing on Nov. 22. In the South, the season begins at noon on Oct. 1 and continues through Oct. 9, followed by a 5-day split, and then reopens on October 15 and continues through Dec. 4. The daily bag limit is 6 ducks including no more than: 4 mallards, of which only one may be a hen, one black duck, none pintail, one canvasback (from Oct. 15-Nov 13 statewide), 2 wood ducks, 2 redheads, and 2 scaup. For Canada geese, the state is apportioned into 3 goose hunting zones: Horicon, Collins and Exterior. Other special goose management subzones within the Exterior Zone include Brown County, Burnett County, Rock Prairie, and the Mississippi River. Season lengths are: Collins Zone – 64 days (3 periods, first period beginning Sept. 16); Exterior Zone – 92 days (North: Sept. 17-23 and Sept. 24 (noon)- Dec. 17 and South: Sept. 17-Sep. 30 and Oct. 1 (noon) – Dec. 17); and Mississippi River subzone- 70 days (Oct. 1 (noon) – Oct. 9 and Oct. 15 – Dec. 14) The Burnett County subzone is closed to Canada goose hunting. The statewide daily bag limit for Canada geese in the Horicon and Collins zones is 2 birds per day during the open seasons within each zone. In the Exterior zone and its subzones the daily bag limit will be 1 bird per day from Sept. 17 –Oct. 2 and 2 birds per day for the remainder of the season.

**Public Comments**

1. Dick Koerner, Neenah, Conservation Congress Migratory Birds Committee Chairman stated that the committee agrees with the Department recommendations except the opening day shooting hours. At their meeting, there was a motion to start the opening day season one half hour before sunrise.
2. Ben Neimann, Hayward stated that he supports changing the zone line to allow for late season diver opportunities in Green Bay. He also stated he would prefer a longer season with fewer birds than more birds in a short season.
3. Peter Peshek, Madison, DeWitt Ross and Stevens commented on the 2006 season. He believes that waterfowl hunting should be physically demanding, intellectually challenging, spiritually rewarding, and where possible minimize user conflicts. He suggested starting season light, have long splits, and have a season well into

December. Next year he suggests implementing a Lake Michigan/Green Bay Zone and a Mississippi zone. The young hunters are concerned about the overlapping dates of youth hunt and goose opening day.

4. **Donald Smith**, LaCrescent, MN stated he hunts both the Mississippi River and Lake Michigan. He wants the Department to look ahead to the 2006 season. He requests flexibility from USFWS to add additional zones.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas adoption of Board Orders WM-19-05 and WM-20-05(E), revisions to NR 10, establishing the 2005 migratory game bird season.**

**Mr. Ela** asked why the federal government is so intent on these zone definitions.

**Mr. Van Horn** stated that if the USFWS allows states to have more opportunity and flexibility to change zone split criteria then it would cloud the impact of other decisions they make about duck hunting.

**Dr. Thomas** asked why is the opening time noon on the opening day.

**Mr. Van Horn** stated that Wisconsin has a higher number of hunters. Opening day can be chaotic. There are safety concerns in the dark.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Welter** asked about sending a letter to the USFWS regarding the support of a third zone.

**Mr. Behnke** stated that the letter has already been written and is waiting for the Chairman's signature.

### 3.B.2. Approval of the Strategy for Wisconsin's Species of Greatest Conservation Need Plan.

**Signe Holtz**, Director, Endangered Resources Bureau stated that in 2001, Congress authorized the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to implement and fund a new program to help states proactively address the needs of declining wildlife species to keep them off and remove them from the federal and state Endangered and Threatened Species Lists. The State Wildlife Grants (SWG) program provides federal funding to every state and territory to conserve its wildlife species of greatest conservation need. In order to be eligible for continued funding under SWG, each state and territory is required to complete a strategy and submit it to the Service by October 1, 2005.

Wisconsin's Strategy for Wildlife Species of Greatest Conservation Need identifies:

1. native wildlife species with low or declining populations are most at risk of no longer being a viable part of Wisconsin's fauna,
2. the habitats with which they are associated,
3. where they occur across the state, and
4. a menu of conservation actions to be developed into specific on-the-ground projects to "get them off and keep them off" any Endangered or Threatened lists in the future.

Wisconsin's Strategy addresses the eight elements required by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and will ensure Wisconsin's continued eligibility for SWG (about \$1 million/year). The plan will help set priorities for the continued allocation of SWG funds in Wisconsin. Maybe more importantly, the resulting database of information on species, their habitats and distributions will provide a range of information in support of the conservation efforts of government agencies, tribes, and public and private partners across the state.

**Steve Willett** asked how the development of this program came about.

**Ms. Holtz** stated that in 2001 the congress passed the SWG programs that provides funding by formula to each state and territory. As part of accepting the funding for SWG in the state there is a requirement to develop a plan.

**Mr. Willett** stated that the Department hasn't followed the normal procedure by sending out for public hearing.

**Ms. Holtz** stated that the plan didn't go out to public hearing, but went out for public comment.

**Mr. Willett** stated it didn't go out for comment under the direction of the Board. So the Department is asking the Board to approve a plan that the Board hasn't authorized public hearings for and made directions on what the Board wants to hear about.

**Ms. Holtz** stated that since it isn't a rule adoption there isn't a requirement to go to public hearing. The Department gave an informational item in April 2004 about this item.

**Mr. Willett** stated that he will vote against this because he didn't think the public had an opportunity to officially comment.

**Mr. Ela** asked how many public meetings there were.

**Ms. Holtz** stated that there were 5 around the state in January. There was also a public comment period during June.

**Mr. Willett** stated that missing from the list of the advisory group is the Wisconsin League of Municipalities, Wisconsin Association of Counties, any representatives from the various builder or realtor groups. The advisory group is inadequate. Has the Department contacted those groups specifically and have they had an opportunity to comment?

**Jill Mrotek**, Property Planner, Northeast Region stated there is a mailing list and some of those groups have been receiving informational updates and have been invited to meetings. They have chosen their level of participation. **Mr. Willett** asked if the information had been sent to the league of municipalities.

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Ms. Thomas approval of the Strategy for Wisconsin's Species of Greatest Conservation Need Plan.**

**Mr. O'Brien** asked if this plan is in any way regulatory.

**Ms. Holtz** stated that it is not regulatory, but through data collection framework it could show where areas of regulation are needed. It's a database that can be used to help people make good decisions.

**Mr. Ela** commented that it's not necessarily a "plan", but a database that will allow more intelligent strategies to be developed for the future. The Board had the opportunity to comment a year ago. He doesn't remember if Mr. Willett was at the meeting. The procedure has been appropriate. It is non-regulatory, non-administrative code. There was no reason for official public hearings and the public had every opportunity to comment.

**Ms. Mrotek** stated that the associations Mr. Willett asked about were receiving information about this process.

**Mr. Poulson** asked if the money from the federal government comes in form of grants and can we distribute it to other organizations once the Department receives it.

**Ms. Holtz** stated that the Department would request permission from the federal government to set up a grant program and if it were approved, we would go through the rule making process that would set up the grant program in Wisconsin.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.3. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order FH-27-05, revisions to NR 25, related to commercial fishing for yellow perch in outlying waters.

**Mike Staggs**, Director, Fisheries Management and Habitat Protection Bureau stated that in 2001 the NRB adopted Board Order FH-12-01, reducing the recreational and commercial harvest of yellow perch from Green Bay. The sport fishing daily bag limit was lowered from 25 to 10 and the total allowable annual commercial harvest was reduced from 200,000 to 20,000 pounds. The rule provided that the changes would expire (sunset) on June 30, 2004. That expiration date was postponed until July 1, 2006, by NRB Order FH-36-03. The proposed rule increases the sport fishing daily bag limit from 10 to 25 and increases the annual total allowable commercial harvest from 20,000 pounds to 60,000 pounds. It also eliminates the sunset clause.

**Mr. O'Brien** asked who does the trolling research.

**Mr. Staggs** stated that it is the DNR's data and research.

**Mr. Welter** asked about the sunset rule and what's the merit of building another sunset rule when this one expires.

**Mr. Staggs** stated the merit would be that the Board along with others would be comfortable that we would be constantly looking at the date and bringing back quota recommendations.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order FH-27-05, revisions to NR 25, related to commercial fishing for yellow perch in outlying waters.**

**Dr. Thomas** asked about the huge year class and their low rate of survival. Does that indicate there isn't enough forage out there to support more fish?

**Mr. Staggs** stated that it could be a food source, depredation, invasive species such as zebra mussels, or water quality.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.4. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WM-29-05, revisions to NR 10 pertaining to deer hunting.

**Keith Warnke**, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that Substantial work with hunting, agriculture, conservation, and other user groups has been undertaken in developing consensus in bringing this package forward. The department recommends public hearings on this rule which includes a trial moratorium on the October gun hunt for 2 years:

- 1) A 2-day youth either sex gun hunt in September (opening 7 days after the bow season opens).
- 2) Late archery season to close the Sunday nearest January 6th.
- 3) Statewide 4-day antlerless gun hunt beginning on the 2nd Thursday following the Thanksgiving holiday.
- 4) In herd control units (currently Zone-T and EAB units) antlerless tags will be unrestricted. The first antlerless tag is free with the purchase of a gun and archery license. Additional tags will be available for a minimal handling fee.

- 5) The archery license would come with two tags valid statewide: one valid for one antlered deer only and the other valid for antlerless only.
- 6) The Hunter's Choice program would be replaced by the sale of antlerless tags valid in limited quota (regular units as additional deer. Antlerless permits would be sold first come, first serve for \$12 each (\$20 for non-residents). Tags would be available on August 1st, one per hunter per day.
- 7) There would be no October 4-day antlerless only hunt outside CWD zones in 2006 and 2007. (In the event that the average antlerless:antlered harvest ratio in herd control units statewide is below 1.4 in 2006, the rule may immediately sunset.) In the event that inadequate herd control is realized as a result of this trial, the 4-day October antlerless deer gun hunt would return in 2008. The start date would be the Thursday nearest October 15 in DMUs where a regular season will not bring the population to within 20% of the over-winter goal.
- 8) The Earn-A-Buck season structure would be an available tool (in 2006 and 2007) for recommendation to the Natural Resources Board based on the criteria currently used (EAB pre-qualification will be implemented).
- 9) A first come-first served system to sell bonus tags as the deer hunting access permission on state parks open to hunting.

**Mr. Welter** asked if it possible to translate the antler/antlerless into a harvest goal and how close we got to the goal in a particular unit.

**Mr. Warnke** stated yes it would be possible, but we didn't want to do that. If we simply compare antler:antlerless harvest ratio to those during the October zone T hunts, it's independent of the population that's on the landscape at the time. We will be analyzing harvest on a region by region basis.

**Mr. Welter** asked if a ratio across a region is found to be below 1.4 and the sunset a one year T zone, then you would re-institute T zone in the units in that region.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that we would re-institute in that region in units where we don't feel a regular 9-day season would get the population back within 20% of the goal.

**Dr. Thomas** asked about coming before the Board for final adoption in December. How will the Board make a decision without knowing the final harvest numbers?

**Mr. Warnke** stated we will have a good idea of harvest numbers by December.

**Mr. Behnke** asked about there being a qualification for EAB in 2005 that would be applicable to the 2006 season and why is that if there will be no EAB in 2006.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that we will continue to retain the option for EAB as a potential tool for herd control.

**Mr. Behnke** asked if the Department's proposal is different from the Conservation Congress' recommendation.

**Mr. Warnke** stated yes, the Conservation Congress spring hearing question called for the elimination of EAB.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WM-29-05, revisions to NR 10 pertaining to deer hunting. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Behnke** stated that this is an ambitious proposal. The real problem is baiting and feeding on private land. There are deer sanctuary on private lands and aren't available for hunting except for hunters who hunt on that private land.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, second by Mr. Poulson approval of the following resolution:**

*WHEREAS, placing feed for deer results in deer feeding at night and less day time deer movement during the deer hunting season.*

*WHEREAS, deer feeding concentrates deer on private land deer sanctuaries, reducing the numbers of deer available to hunters on nearby public and private lands.*

*WHEREAS, the Department is proposing a rule that eliminates the October T zone hunt for two years, in an effort to harvest an adequate number of deer to control the deer herd during the regular 9 day gun deer season and a statewide 4 day December hunt.*

*WHEREAS, deer feeding before and during the deer gun season can reduce the numbers of deer available to hunters and impact the ability to harvest an adequate number of deer to control the deer herd.*

*THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Department solicit public input, during rules hearings on the 2006 deer season proposal, on banning deer baiting and feeding statewide 10 days before and during the 9 day gun deer season, to promote deer movement during shooting hours and more even distribution of deer available to deer hunters.*

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that using input received from the public hearings, the Department develop a statutory proposal to authorize banning deer baiting and feeding before and during the deer gun season, and that such proposal be submitted to the State Legislature for their passage in time for the 2006 deer season.*

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela to amend the resolution to state “*THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Department solicit public input, during rules hearings on the 2006 deer season proposal, on banning deer baiting and feeding statewide.*”**

**Mr. Willett** stated he would support Mr. Behnke’s resolution because it’s a start and if we amend it we will be back to square one. If it works, we can expand it.

**Mr. Behnke** agreed with Mr. Willett and stated this is a big step and we need legislative approval. It is reasonable to ask the legislature to approve the ban before and during season, but there is a big economy in baiting and feeding.

**Mr. Ela** agreed with Mr. Behnke that it is a good first step.

**Mr. Welter** asked if the 10-day ban before and during ban would solve one problem to restore normal feeding patterns. It doesn’t solve the exploding deer population of does having twins and triplets. Perhaps banning baiting and feeding during the month of November is a good compromise.

**Mr. Behnke** agrees with Mr. Welter and feels the same way, but this is to bring success to the proposal to eliminate the October T zone hunt and kill the number of deer necessary during the November 9 day season.

**Mr. Warnke** stated that the 10-day ban will get the deer moving and looking for food.

Vote on the Amendment

Mr. Behnke – No	Mr. Ela – No	Mr. Welter – Yes	Mr. Willett – No
Mr. Poulson – No	Dr. Thomas – No	Mr. O’Brien – No	

**Mr. Welter MOVED to amend the amendment to” banning deer baiting and feeding the month of November. The motion failed for lack of a second.**

**The original motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Dr. Thomas** stated there are some things to consider for final adoption. She asked for accurate final deer numbers and how they line up with meeting our goals. Further, she would like the Department to seek input from Secretary of Tourism on how the 4 day T Zone hunt in October affects tourism in Wisconsin.

3.B.5. Request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WM-30-05, revisions to NR 10 pertaining to establishing a deer hunting season at Straight Lake Wilderness state park

**Keith Warnke**, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that this rule proposes a deer firearm season beginning on the Saturday immediately preceding the Thanksgiving holiday and continuing for 9 consecutive days followed by a muzzleloading firearm season beginning on the following Monday and continuing for 10 consecutive days.

The 2,779-acre Brunkow Hardwoods Cooperation department land acquisition in northern Polk County has allowed for the establishment of the Straight River Wildlife Area and Straight Lake Wilderness State Park. Together the state park and wildlife area is an undeveloped, heavily wooded property that is relatively pristine and undisturbed. It contains an extremely rich diversity of flora and fauna as well as very unusual geographic features. Without a deer-hunting season to control deer populations on the state park property, deer herd control will not occur at the State Park for several years (until the master plan is complete). This will result in an increasing deer population, which typically results in increased direct and indirect adverse impacts on the native plant communities. This rule proposes a conservative deer season in advance of a completed master plan that may be modified should the property master plan prescribe an alternative hunting season structure. Initial meetings with interest groups support hunting on the property in advance of a completed master plan.

Typically the establishment of rules does not precede master plan completion. However, in this instance potential direct adverse impacts on native plant communities has led the department to establish deer hunting season in advance of the final property master plan. If the master planning process results in a recommendation for an alternative deer season framework and regulations, then the department will initiate rule making to implement the preferred season structure.

**Mr. Behnke** asked about the history of deer hunting at Straight Lakes.

**Mr. Ela** stated that it was leased for hunting. He asked if this proposal applies to entire 2,800 acres.

**Kurt Thiede**, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Management Bureau stated that the wildlife area portion is like any other wildlife area, open to hunting. The state park portion needs approval.

**Laurie Osterndorf**, Administrator, Division of Land stated that the Board officially established a project area and it will be governed in accordance to a feasibility study until there’s a master plan.

**Mr. Welter** asked if the property will be signed to state that it will not be open during the archery season.

**Mr. Warnke** stated it will be signed as a state park based on the special regulations.



**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of request authorization for public hearing of Board Order WM-30-05, revisions to NR 10 pertaining to establishing a deer-hunting season at Straight Lake Wilderness State Park. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.6. Forest Legacy Easement Acquisition, Langlade County

**Richard Steffes**, Real Estate Director stated the Department has obtained an agreement to purchase an 18,511.94-acre easement from Plum Creek Timberlands.

**Mr. Behnke** asked if there will be a master plan developed for this property.

**Mr. Steffes** stated there was a baseline document with the forestry staff that will be part of the easement documentation. It's not a master plan, but it's a planning document.

**Mr. Behnke** asked how will the public have an opportunity to comment on this.

**Paul Delong**, Administrator, Forestry Division stated the public access to this property is that which is required under managed forest law. The required access is for hunting, fishing, sightseeing, cross-country skiing, and bird watching. All other access is decided by the landowner. Snowmobile use was part of the agreement because it was already existing. The Department could work with the landowner to approve other uses.

**Mr. Welter** asked if that applies to both the Ice Age Trail segment and the forest segment.

**Mr. Delong** stated that the Ice Age Trail segment has specific agreements associated with its uses that are compatible with the Ice Age trail.

**Mr. Ela** asked if the trail exists at the present time.

**Mr. Delong** stated that yes by agreement.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Forest Legacy Easement Acquisition, Langlade County.**

**Mr. Willett** congratulated the Department on this acquisition.

**Mr. Behnke** asked if Plum Creek continues to be the landowner and if this easement just allows for the uses outlined by Mr. Delong.

**Mr. Steffes** stated that whatever terms are in the easement today, Plum Creek is obligated to follow.

**Mr. Welter** asked if the obligations pass on to subsequent owners.

**Mr. Steffes** stated yes.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.7. Land Acquisition, Lower Chippewa River Natural Area, Dunn and Eau Claire Counties

**Mr. Poulson** stated he is concerned about the statement "it will be kept as crop land until. . ." He thinks it should be kept in cropland indefinitely.

**Mr. Steffes** stated it could be plowed up in the future if there is a change in policy.

**Mr. Poulson** stated that once farmland goes into grassland and trees begin to grow, you don't re-plow it.

**Mr. Steffes** stated that there is an easement in Iowa County coming up that is a good example of the Farm Land Preservation Easement that buffers a state park. For this project the managers would like to see the habitat improved here. Perhaps there is some middle ground that can be achieved.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Dr. Thomas approval of land Acquisition, Lower Chippewa River Natural Area, Dunn and Eau Claire Counties.**

**Mr. Welter** stated that this land is in the path of rural development outside the city of Eau Claire. The landowners have been good stewards of this land.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.8. Land Acquisition, Lower Wisconsin State Riverway, Richland County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of Land Acquisition, Lower Wisconsin State Riverway, Richland County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.9. Land Acquisition, Ice Age Trail, Dane County

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter approval of Land Acquisition, Ice Age Trail, Dane County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.10. Land Acquisition, Dewey Marsh Wildlife Area, Portage County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of Land Acquisition, Dewey Marsh Wildlife Area, Portage County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.11. Land Acquisition, Kettle Moraine State Forest – Southern Unit, Jefferson County

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke approval of Land Acquisition, Kettle Moraine State Forest – Southern Unit, Jefferson County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.12. Land Acquisition, Wild Rose Hatchery, Waushara County

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of Land Acquisition, Wild Rose Hatchery, Waushara County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.13. Land Acquisition, State Fisheries Habitat Program, Oconto County

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela approval of Land Acquisition, State Fisheries Habitat Program, Oconto County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.14. Easement Acquisition, Governor Dodge State Park, Iowa County

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke approval with boundary modifications of Easement Acquisition, Governor Dodge State Park, Iowa County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

3.B.15. Land Donation, Statewide Wildlife Habitat Area, St. Croix County

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Land Donation, Statewide Wildlife Habitat Area, St. Croix County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

**Mr. Welter** expressed the appreciation by the Board for this generous donation.

3.B.16. Land Donation, Gift Lands Program, Price County

**Dr. Thomas MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of Land Donation, Gift Lands Program, Price County. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

4. Citizen Participation

4.A. Citizen Recognition

4.A.1. DONATION - The Heritage Hill Foundation Inc. will donate an \$800,000 Education Center addition to the existing Park Entrance Visitor Station at Heritage Hill State Park in Green Bay.

**Secretary Hassett** presented a plaque to Heritage Hill Foundation Inc. and thanked the foundation for their generous donation.

**Barb Miller**, Heritage Hill Foundation Inc. accepted the plaque and thanked the Department. She invited the Board to hold a summer meeting at the facility next summer.

**Mr. Behnke** complimented the Foundation on the hard work.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela acceptance of The Heritage Hill Foundation Inc. donation of \$800,000 Education Center addition at Heritage Hill State Park in Green Bay. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

4.B. Citizen Participation

4.B.1. **Randy Baumann**, Menasha, AFL-CIO Conservation Committee stated that his organization is comprised of a group of unions from throughout the state. He plans on attending future meetings to share the opinion of his organization on certain conservation issues.

4.B.2. **Greg Kazmierski**, Waukesha, Wisconsin Deerhunters Coalition commented on 2005 advanced Earn-a-Buck. His group opposes any form of EAB because it goes against the very principles of hunting. Hunting is the act of pursuing

game. There are over 40 units that have advanced EAB this year. Hunters don't understand how to qualify for a buck next year. There is over regulation and there is only a 40% hunter retention rate in the state. He asked the Board to direct the Department to have an outreach program that's effective to get deer hunters on board with the proposal.

- 4.B.3. **Duane Herbert**, Barron County Administrator stated that the county has been trying to negotiate with the Department on the purchase of the Borisly Property purchase. He distributed a timeline of the project and wanted the Board to be aware of the situation.

**Jack Nedland**, Barron County Forest Administrator stated that last year the DNR Fish Manager looked at the property and stated there are headwater remnants of a stream and there are springs on the property. The land was appraised. One of the DNR's concerns is the short tenure of ownership, but in Tax Deed ownerships, that's usually the case. He explained the timeline further. If the DNR doesn't go through with this purchase, the property will go on the market and there will be a trophy house built on the property and will be lost to the public.

**Mr. Behnke** asked the Department to respond.

**Mr. Steffes** stated that the staff acted in good faith, but the DNR should have brought it to a head sooner than we did. After further review, he thought there should be 50% contribution from the county since they only have \$6,000 invested into the property. That was not agreed to by the County.

**Mr. Nedland** stated that there has never been an official offer and without that we can't take it to the County Board for their approval.

**Mr. Ela** suggesting finding other partners that would contribute to this purchase.

- 4.B.4. **Mark Toso**, Roberts, Wisconsin Deer Hunters Association commented on deer baiting and feeding. He is pleased with the discussion about baiting and feeding that took place today. He distributed a study about baiting in South Carolina. There are baiting and no baiting zones in that state. In the no bait zones they found that deer harvest is 33% higher. Until baiting and feeding is under control, Wisconsin is going to have deer population problems.

5. Board Members' Matters

5.A. Approve 2006 NRB Meeting Schedule

**Mr. O'Brien** suggested that the Board should consider setting aside July 26<sup>th</sup> for a Madison meeting. It will be a tentative meeting if it is needed.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Welter to approve the 2006 NRB meeting schedule with an additional, tentative meeting scheduled for July 26, 2006.**

**Dr. Thomas** stated that the Board had two conference call meetings between the June and August meeting. Both were relatively short and it takes a lot of money and staff time to plan a two day Board meeting.

**Secretary Hassett** stated that there is a lot of work and resources that goes into these meetings. The staff appreciates the two months in the year where there isn't a Board meeting.

**The motion carried 6-1. Dr. Thomas voted no.**

**Dr. Thomas** asked Secretary Hassett to check the calendar to see if March dates conflict the North American Wildlife and Resource Management Conference conflicts with it.

**Mr. Behnke** stated he is concerned about elk feeding. He requested the Department to make a presentation at the October meeting regarding an update on Elk and the factors that affect their health.

**Mr. Ela** stated he would like an update on the Watertown tire fire.

**Mr. Welter** stated that the listening session last night was productive and helpful. He would like to continue having them. He is concerned about streams that are being de-watered. He would like to investigate the Department's legal leverage under the ground water protection act to protect these waters. He asked the Secretary to direct staff to investigate the two dry up situations. He would like a report at the next meeting the options available to us and whether or not some action under the public trust doctrine is available to us to abate these activities and protect the streams. The two streams of concern are Cooks Creek and Little Plover.

**Mr. Poulson** asked for a report on the rules for municipal well pumping and going outside their municipal boundaries to drill a city well.

6. Special Committees' Reports

None.

- 7. Department Secretary's Matters
- 7.A. Retirement Resolutions
- 7.A.1. Bruce B. Zuehlke
- 7.A.2. James J. Martin
- 7.A.3. Mark A. Schuelke
- 7.A.4. David A. Campbell
- 7.A.5. Michael L. Toney
- 7.A.6. Mary Jo Kopecky
- 7.A.7. Robert P. Chose
- 7.A.8. Ruthe E. Badger

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of retirement resolutions. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 7.B. Donations
- 7.B.1. Mr. Leo Woods, a life-long visitor to Wildcat Mountain State Park will donate \$10,000 to the Wildcat Mountain State Park gift account.

**Mr. Welter MOVED, seconded by Mr. Poulson approval of \$10,000 donation from Mr. Leo Woods to Wildcat Mountain State Park gift account. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 7.B.2. Ducks Unlimited will donate \$40,000 to the Bureau of Wildlife Management to cover costs related to ongoing wetland restoration work within the Glacial Habitat Restoration Area.

**Mr. Ela MOVED, seconded by Mr. Willett approval of \$40,000 donation from Ducks Unlimited to the Bureau of Wildlife Management to cover costs related to ongoing wetland restoration work within the Glacial Habitat Restoration Area. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 7.B.3. The National Wild Turkey Foundation will donate \$6,000 to the Wildlife Management for the purchase an ATV with tracks and sprayer unit to use in Marquette and Green counties on prescribed burns and for invasive vegetation treatment.

**Mr. Willett MOVED, seconded by Mr. Behnke approval of \$6,000 donation from The National Wild Turkey Foundation for the purchase an ATV with tracks and sprayer unit to use in Marquette and Green counties on prescribed burns and for invasive vegetation treatment. The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

- 8. Information Items
- 8.A. Air, Waste, and Water/Enforcement  
None

- 8.B. Land Management, Recreation, and Fisheries/Wildlife
- 8.B.1. Introduction of vision, mission, and draft strategic goals for Wisconsin State Park System.  
**Bill Morrissey**, Director, Parks Bureau stated that to plan for meeting the needs of Wisconsin citizens and protection of natural resources, State Parks has begun the process of revising its 1995 Strategic Plan. The new plan will be developed with extensive internal and external input. Internal teams consisting of central office, regional, and field staff are working on strategies. Public focus groups will soon be involved. The new strategic plan will re-focus the direction of the state park program to meet the needs of a changing population and the financial challenges we face while adhering to the natural roots that the system is founded upon.  
**Mr. Willett** asked if we need to step up the development and acquisition of State Parks.  
**Mr. Morrissey** stated yes that the public is extremely interested in state parks, education programs, preserving the landscapes and recreation opportunities. For the past 30 years we have been in a holding pattern and haven't developed very many new parks.  
**Mr. Willett** asked if Gov. Thompson State Park is filling up like Devil's Lake State Park.  
**Mr. Morrissey** stated that Gov. Thompson isn't developed yet, but he thinks it will fill up all the time. Devil's Lake is an extraordinary park, but it is being overrun as are a number of other parks. If we had additional parks, that would spread out the use. He added that state parks are 60-65% self-sufficient just in fees, but we are totally self-sufficient if the money spent in the local economies by visitors. The problem is the infrastructure.  
**Mr. Behnke** asked if Wisconsin is still applying for the Gold Medal Award of state parks.

**Mr. Morrissey** stated that we are not entered into the competition. Wisconsin was a finalist for the Gold Medal award a couple of years ago, but that was only among the states that applied for the award, and not many applied due to the high level of staff effort and resources necessary.

**Mr. Behnke** asked if the policy of buying trail corridors, developing them, and the turning them over to partners to run and maintain is working well.

**Mr. Morrissey** stated that it is working reasonably well. It's the only way that we are able to keep the trails open. It lacks a certain consistency across the state. Since they fall under the definition of a state trail, we can market them better as a system.

**Mr. Ela** complimented Mr. Morrissey on the vision and mission statements, however the general tone of what follows is a disconnect. Many things that follow do not define what the park role should be in the totality of the state recreational opportunities, but trying to enter into as many arenas as possible. It will negate your putting out your mission statement provision. Rather than expanding into all these new areas, it should be defined what the system can do well and what differentiates our park system from other park systems.

**Mr. Morrissey** stated that the goals have come from inside the state park system as well as from the public. As far as ATVs go, one of our goals is to protect the natural resource and we don't think ATVs fit into that goal. We do have ATV areas at Richard Bong State Recreation Area.

8.B.2. Crex Meadows Wildlife Area Expansion Project Informational Item

**John Gozdziński**, Director, Northern Region introduced Dan Daniels.

**Dave Daniels**, Regional Lands Planner, Northern Region stated that at the request of the Natural Resources Board, during the winter of 2005, the Department undertook a Feasibility Study to explore the possibility of expanding both Crex Meadows Wildlife Area and Governor Knowles State Forest. The proposed expansion proposal would create a common boundary between the two state owned properties, and provide potential opportunities for improved wildlife habitat by providing a mix of forest and barrens habitat, improved recreational opportunities and streamlining of Department management efforts in Burnett County. After two rounds of public involvement, staff has concluded that the project is not feasible at this time. As noted in the accompanying background memo, there is no support for the project at the local government level. The lack of support is because local government disagrees with the state's Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) formula that is used on public lands purchased prior to 1992, and perceived inequities of that PILT formula.

**Mr. Willett** asked what the next step is.

**Mr. Daniels** stated it is up to the Board whether we go ahead with the project or whether more work needs to be done in the community regarding payment in lieu of taxes and how it affects the township.

**Mr. Behnke** stated he believes that the Department has done all that they can in the community. There is a high level of support overall.

**Mr. Behnke MOVED, seconded by Mr. Ela that the Department to bring a Crex Meadows boundary expansion recommendation to the Board at the October meeting.**

**Mr. Willett** asked if that would be an authorization to go to public hearings.

**Mr. Behnke** stated there has been public input all along the way.

**Mr. Willett** stated that the municipalities have gone on record that they are opposed to the expansion.

**Mr. Behnke** stated that they could appear at the October NRB meeting to voice their concerns.

**Mr. Ela** asked about the various resolutions received from local governments. Were any of them address substantially whether or not the expansion should be made?

**Mr. Daniels** stated that several of them told him personally that they generally agreed with the proposal, however the overarching issue is the payment in lieu of taxes.

**Mr. Behnke** stated the payment in lieu of taxes that will not be resolved by this Board because we don't have the authority to do that. It is a legislative matter.

**Mr. Welter** stated that it's important to emphasize that the Department isn't going to exercise the power of eminent domain and that they will only enter into agreements with willing sellers.

**The motion carried unanimously by all members.**

8.B.3. Lake Superior Basin Brook Trout Plan

**Mike Staggs** introduced the presenters and gave a short history of the project.

**Bob Adair**, Great Lakes Fishery Program Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service stated he appreciates the opportunity to develop a joint plan with the DNR. He thanked the staff for sticking with the plan even through issues and challenges.

**Laura Hewitt**, Watershed Program Director, Trout Unlimited stated TU is pleased to be a part of this plan with USFWS and DNR. Their hope is that the plan keeps moving forward.

**Stephen Schram**, Regional Team Supervisor, Northern Region stated that the Wisconsin Lake Superior Basin Brook Trout Plan was developed jointly between the Wisconsin DNR and the US Fish and Wildlife Services. The plan describes the life history of, threats to, and management of brook trout in the Wisconsin portion of the Lake Superior Basin and its tributaries, and suggests a goal, objectives and tactics to protect and rehabilitate depleted brook trout populations. The plan has received public review and is complete.

The goals of the plan are to protect and improve self-sustaining brook trout populations and their habitat in Wisconsin's Lake Superior Basin and attempt to establish several populations that exhibit life history diversity (both stream resident and migratory 'coaster' life history types). Objectives, problems and tactics are described for topic areas of: 1. Stream habitat and watershed health, 2. Harvest, 3. Rehabilitation stocking, 4. Genetics management, 5. Life history and management, 6. Species interactions, and 7. Outreach. Brook trout population assessments and/or rehabilitation experiments are already underway for priority populations in the basin. As we learn more from these assessments and experiments, detailed management plans will be developed and adapted to address the needs of each priority population. Federal and tribal agencies along with sports clubs and anglers have reviewed and endorsed the plan as written. The success of this plan will depend on a long-term commitment to manage watersheds to protect and restore tributary habitat-forming processes, and will likely involve partnerships between management agencies and citizens to achieve the goal.

**Mr. Welter** stated that he is glad to see this plan come through. He asked about Splake - a cross between lake trout and brook trout and asked what the bag limit is. Can anglers tell the difference and identify them correctly?

**Mr. Schram** stated it's a 5-bag limit with a 15" minimum. There are problems with identification of Splake and we have developed identification cards and worked with anglers. However, we don't see a lot of brook trout in the lake anymore. Splake are a near shore fish.

**Mr. Welter** suggested including a picture of splake in future regulations so anglers can easier distinguish them.

**Mr. Ela** asked if the removal of beaver dams is necessary or could beaver coexistence with the brook trout.

**Mr. Schram** stated that yes it is necessary to remove beaver dams and they probably can't coexist together because historically brook trout populations were highest when beaver were trapped out.

#### 8.B.4. **Wolves' effects on Cattle per request of Board Member Behnke.**

**Greg Palmquist**, Veterinarian, gave an overview and histories of wolf depredations on the Fornengo farm. T&T Ranch (Fornengo) has grown from about 100 cows in 1985 to about 700 cows this year. The depredation problems in this herd started out with a low number of calves lost each year, progressed to quite high calf losses in recent years, and loss of some cows. Nothing seemed to work well in preventing or controlling losses, except when lethal control was implemented in 2003. One year a shock collar was placed on the alpha female and seemed to help the losses for the remainder of that year. In 2002 during the course of my examination of the herd, it was noted that the cows were very agitated and clustered close together. They were not spread out grazing, drinking, and resting like they normally would be during the day. Many cows were wandering around bellowing, likely searching for their missing calves. The dead calves I examined had various causes of death - some only signs of heart problems, some had pneumonia and some had been choked to death from bites to the neck. The conclusion he came to was that somehow this depredation must be stopped for humane reasons and for the economic viability of this ranch. He also documented the number of calves versus number of cows processed each fall. It was interesting to note that the increase in losses is happening at the same time that the wolf population is increasing. He gave a number of losses and problems besides calf loss.

**Mr. Ela** asked about depredations since trapping has been permitted on the Fornengo farm.

**Mr. Palmquist** stated that in 2003 they trapped, then 2004 there was very little loss. Since they were so frustrated with the system they didn't call out USDA. This year, trapping was instituted two or three weeks ago and he doesn't know where they are at right now.

**Mr. Behnke** asked how many farms are you working with that are having wolf problems.

**Mr. Palmquist** stated that the only ones calling people in are the Fornengos. There are at least six farms with missing calves.

**Mr. Behnke** asked if trapping is the best method to stop depredation.

**Dr. Palmquist** stated yes, for the one year they trapped, the next year went well. However, it's important to be proactive because of the other affects that wolves have on the herd health.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.